

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION VI 1445 ROSS AVENUE, SUITE 1200 DALLAS, TEXAS 75202

September 15, 1988

MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: Meeting Summary Regarding South Cavalcade Site

FROM:

Larry Wright, P.E., Acting Chief Superfund Enforcement Branch (6H-E)

TO: File

Meeting Date: August 29, 1988

Time: 4:00 p.m.

Merchants Fast Motor Freight Line Terminal, Location:

Houston, Texas (Located on

South Cavalcade Superfund Site) Attendees: Rod Redimyer-Property Manager

Debra Mitchell-Brown Maroney Law Firm

Larry Wright-EPA, Dallas Jim Pendergast-EPA, Dallas

Bill Eckroade-EPA, Washington, D.C.

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the proposed plan for Summary: cleanup for the South Cavalcade site, to determine possible impacts on future operation's of the company at the site, and to answer question's about site remediation. Jim Pendergast gave

a short presentation that highlighted the following.

a. Site history and nature of contaminants onsite;

b. Results of remedial investigation, especially as related to where contamination was found in soils and groundwater;

c. Potential migration pathways of contaminants and endangerment posed by site conditions;

d. Proposed plan for cleanup, including discussion of technologies to be used in specific areas of their operations;

e. Request for information related to the company's future plans for expansion; and

f. Establishment of communication between the company and EPA throughout the duration of the project.

Mr. Redimyer and Ms. Mitchell had a number of questions related to the results of the site investigation and proposed plan:

a. How long would site remediation take?

b. Has soil flushing been proven?

c. Will there be disruption of company operations when the cleanup is implemented? Would piping be buried?

d. Is Merchants considered by EPA to be a responsible party?

e. Who will pay for and conduct the remediation? f. What is the timeframe before remediation starts?

S

!~

₹

 ∞

0

0

They indicated the fact sheets provided by EPA had been handed out to employees and a copy posted in the lunch room area. They had received no questions about the fact sheets or the proposed plan.

EPA stated that disruptions to their operations should be minimal. The company was told that as a current property owner, they were considered to be a PRP. It was indicated that former owners and operators who were responsible for operations causing the contamination would be given the opportunity to conduct the cleanup but in any event, Merchants would be contacted regarding provision of access and deed restrictions.

۴.

0084